

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 10, and 17 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-5, and 7-21 are pending.

Claims 1-5, and 7-9 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jammes (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,149) in view of Gregg (U.S. Patent No. 6,156,416) and Wanderski (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,617). Claims 10-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James in view of Gregg. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “an application gateway server ... comprising: a navigation module for receiving a data in a predetermined format and accessing a device specific information of said remote access device; ... a rendering module for interfacing with the navigation module, wherein said rendering module interacts with said navigation module to cause said navigation module to reformat said data for said remote access device based on said device specific information.”

Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, “assembling and rendering said subscriber information into a device specific format, said device specific format depending on, and received from, said subscriber device.”

Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “a navigation module for receiving from a subscriber device a subscriber information request in a first format, said first format including a device specific information of said subscriber device, obtaining requested information, and transmitting the requested information to said subscriber in a second format; ... a rendering module for reformatting the requested information to the second format based on said device specific information obtained by said navigation module.”

Jammes discloses a system and method for designing and operating an electronic commerce store on the Internet. Referring, for example, to Fig. 1, Jammes discloses a system where a consumer can operate a web browser 102 to connect over the Internet 104 to contact the electronic store. The electronic store comprises a web server 106 coupled to a database server 114, which in turn is coupled to a data storage device 116.

The Office Action alleges that Jammes discloses each element of the claimed invention with the exception of a session module. However, Jammes also fails to disclose or suggest a navigation module which, *inter alia*, obtains device specific information regarding the user's remote access device, and, in connection with a rendering module, reformats the requested information based upon the device specific information. These features are recited in the above quoted portions of independent claim 1 and 17. Similarly, Jammes also fails to disclose or suggest, the act of "assembling and rendering said subscriber information into a device specific format, said device specific format depending on, and received from, said subscriber device," as recited in the above quoted portion of independent claim 10.

For example, the Office Action states the Jammes discloses the navigation module at column 9, lines 1-10, column 7, lines 8-17 and lines 30-39, and column 12, lines 1-10. However, the passage at column 9, lines 1-10 merely discloses a web server, the passages at column 7, lines 8-17 and 30-39 defines the acronyms URL, HTML, and HTTP, and the passage at column 9, lines 1-10, further describe a web server receiving a URL and returning a page in HTML. These passages fails to disclose or suggest the above noted features recited in the independent claims.

The Office Action additionally cites to Wanderski, which discloses a system for translating an input document into XML format and dynamically generating an associated document type definition (DTD) document, and Gregg, which discloses a system and method for controlling access to computer resources over a unsecured computer network using a client hardware key which interacts with software on a server. Neither of these references, whether taken individually, or in combination with each other or with Jammes, disclose or suggest the above noted features recited in the independent claims.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10, and 17 are believed to be allowable. The depending claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 21, 2006

By: 

Christopher S. Chow
Reg. No. 46,493
(858) 845-3249

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502